APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/524,112	12/09/2005	Harlan A. Hurwitz	115572.04	2383

25944	7590	05/27/2009		

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. BOX 320850
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850

EXAMINER
SCARITO, JOHN D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3696	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/27/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>25 February 2009</u>.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
   closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1,3-18,23 and 35</u> is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1, 3-18, 23 & 35</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

   1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in

37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is

eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e)

has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to

37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 02/25/2009 has been entered.

The following is Examiner's response to Applicant's amendment received 02/25/2009

stemming from Examiner's Final Office Action dated 11/25/2008.

Status of the Claims

As per Applicant's response, Examiner acknowledges that Applicant amended Claims 1,

10, 23 & 35 and cancelled Claim 2. Claims 19-22, 24-34 & 36-50 were previously cancelled.

Here, Claims 3-18 are either presented as originally filed or previously presented, but are

considered amended due to their dependence on amended claims. As such, Claims 1, 3-18, 23 &

35 are currently pending.

Response to Remarks/Arguments

Minor Claim Objections

Claims 1, 5, & 23 were objected to because of informalities:

As per Claim 1 & 23, Examiner withdraws his objections. Here, "can be done", in this

instance, does not appear to suggest optional language since Applicant positively requires

performing the user login operation. As such, "can be done" appears to indicate a

temporal aspect of when the login operation is initiated by the user.

As per Claim 5, Examiner withdraws his objection in view of Applicant's amendment

entered in the Advisory Action of 02/13/2009.

Statutory Grounds of Rejection

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found

in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112-1st & 2nd Paragraphs

Claims 1-18, 23 & 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to

comply with the written description requirement.

As per Claims 1-18 & 23, Examiner withdraws his rejections in view of Applicant's

amendments. (i.e. Claims 1 & 23 were amended to require user initiation of the user login

operation "once for each time the payment media is received in the input receptacle".

As per Claim 35, Examiner maintains his rejection. Unlike Claims 1 & 23, Applicant

failed to indicate that the login operation occurs "once". [see Advisory Action of

02/13/2009]. Thus "multiple login operations", even for each time the payment media is

received, is a reasonable interpretation not supported by Applicant's disclosure.

Examiner withdraws his 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection of Claim 5 in the

Final Office Action of 11/25/2008 in view of Applicant's amendment entered in the Advisory

Action of 02/13/2009.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 4, 11, 16-18, 23 & 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Siemens [6,659,340] in view of Ling [2002/0111907]; Claims 2, 3, & 8-10

were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Siemens [6,659,340] in view of

Ling [2002/0111907] and further in view of Kenneth et al [5,796,083]; Claims 5 & 6 were

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Siemens [6,659,340] in view of Ling

[2002/0111907] and further in view of Stefanik et al [2003/0163382]; Claim 7 was rejected

under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Siemens [6,659,340] in view of Ling

[2002/0111907] and further in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA); Claim 12 was

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Siemens [6,659,340] in view of Ling

[2002/0111907] and further in view of Kenneth et al [5,796,083] or, alternatively, further in view

of Katou et al [6,481,620]; and Claims 13-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Siemens [6,659,340] in view of Ling [2002/0111907] in view of Kenneth et al

[5,796,083] and further in view of Clark [6,081,791].

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new

ground(s) of rejection which were necessitated by Applicant's amendment.

In particular, Applicant has incorporated the limitations of cancelled claim 2 into Claims

1, 23 & 35 [Applicant's Response, page 7, lines 21-22] and indicates that "processing of

the payment media comprises validating and counting the payment media" [Applicant's

Response, page 8, line 5].

Response to Amendments

Minor Claim Objections

Claims 6, 9, 11, 12 & 17 are objected to because of the following informalities:

1. As per Claim 6, Examiner suggests "the <u>at least one</u> single store" for consistency.

2. As per Claim 9, Examiner suggests "processing of the payment media <u>further</u>
   includes...". Next, claim 9 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of
   improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a
   previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the
   claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in
   independent form. Here, Claim 1 already contemplates processing as including
   "counting the payment media". As such, Claim 9 can be read (i.e. "one of") as not
   further limiting Claim 8.

3. As per Claim 11, Examiner notes that Applicant deleted the language "currency
   vouchers" in Claim 10. Examiner questions whether Applicant intended to delete
   it in Claim 11 as well.

4. As per Claim 12, Examiner suggests "previously ~~accepted~~ <u>received</u>" for
   consistency with Claim 1. Currency is never "accepted" in the body of Claim 1.
   Further, as per MPEP 2016 "language that suggests or makes optional but does

not require…does not limit the scope of a claim…". In this vein, "is capable of"

does not positively require that the machine dispense payment media as claimed.

5. As per Claim 17, Examiner suggests "the [[a]] successful user login operation"

since it already holds antecedence in Claim 16.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112-1ˢᵗ & 2ⁿᵈ Paragraphs

Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the

written description requirement.

<u>As per Claim 35</u>, Examiner points Applicant to his maintained rejection above.

Claims 1, 3-18, 23 & 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention.

<u>As per Claims 1, 23 & 35</u>, Examiner questions what "validating...the payment media"

comprises. In particular, Applicant indicates validity as related to identification of funds

[see Applicant's Specification, paragraph 125], as related to a characteristic of the note

[see Applicant's Specification, paragraphs 186 & 195], and as related to a characteristic

of listed legal payment media originating sources or payment media registers [see

Applicant's Specification, paragraph 219]. For purposes of examination, Examiner will

assume that "validating" refers to verifying identifiable funds (i.e. as legal tender). Next,

Applicant states that the payment media is stored in a secure device "until the user login

operation is completed". Examiner questions whether this language implies that the payment media is stored in an unsecure device after the user login operation. Further, Applicant's "until" limitation becomes inoperative in the instance where the user login operation is performed before receipt and processing of the payment media. Applicant must particularly claim his/her invention.

As per Claim 3, Examiner will assume, for purposes of examination, that Applicant intended to depend from Claim 1 since Claim 2 is cancelled.

As per Claims 5, Examiner questions whether "a retail store" must comprise all of or just one of "at least one single store, multiple stores, at least one third party concession stand located within the at least one store and a plurality of stores located within a mall". Stated another way, does Applicant's machine have to be used by the cashier/employee in all of the respective locations to meet the claim language?

As per Claim 6, Examiner points Applicant to the issue discussed in Claim 5 above. Further, Examiner questions whether Applicant intends his/her "employee of a company different from the retail store" to initiate login "once for each time the payment media is received in the input receptacle". Examiner suspects that a courier service would not be called each time a drop is made.

As per Claim 9, Examiner questions what "authenticating the payment media" comprises. Examiner was unable to find a sufficient explanation in Applicant's Specification [see paragraphs 28, 44 & 56]. As such, for purposes of examination, Examiner will assume that "authenticating" refers to verifying funds as legal tender. Next, Claim 1 already introduces processing as including "counting the payment media".

As per Claim 15, Claim 3 indicates "**one** or more of a roll store…an escrow device...or a secure compartment". As such, Claim 15 assumes an "escrow device" is chosen in Claim 3 which may not be the case. For example if Examiner finds a secure device comprising a secure compartment, Claim 15 would not make sense because an escrow device is not contemplated. Next, the term "unsuccessful" is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "unsuccessful" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. Here, Applicant does not explicitly define a measure of success. [see Applicant's Specification, paragraph 193, "If the login process fails the user will be prompted to login again", i.e. not linked to "unsuccessful"]. Success can be subjective as well as objective, thus Examiner asks Applicant to clarify the record.

As per Claims 16 & 17, similar to Claim 15, "successful" and "successfully" are relative terms which render the claim indefinite. Examiner seeks clarification.

As per Claims 4, 7, 8, 10-14 & 18, said Claims are rejected due to their dependence on rejected claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on
sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 11, 18, 23 & 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by Keith, III et al [5,695,038].

As per Claim 1, Keith ('038) teaches the method as follows:

First, Keith ('038) teaches receiving the payment media in an input receptacle of the machine;

[Abstract, "drop safe for receiving and [] storing currency" & column 11, lines 48-50,

"each deposit into a drop safe [] by transfer through the acceptors of the present safe" &

column 6, lines 18-20, "bill acceptors...for inserting currency or similar bills into the

interior space within the drop safe"]

Next, Keith ('038) teaches starting processing of the payment media as soon as the payment media has

been received in the input receptacle and wherein...the processing of the payment media comprises

validating and counting the payment media [column 6, lines 30-32 & lines 46-51, "acceptor

draws that bill into the slot and examines characteristics of the bill to evaluate its

authenticity" & see column 2, lines 65-66, "denominations of accepted currency so as to

record the amounts deposited" & column 11, lines 51-53, "amount of each deposit...is

important [] for overall accountability" & column 2, lines 40-41, "identify and count

currency placed in the safe by several persons"]

Next, Keith ('038) teaches performing the user login operation; wherein: the step of performing the

user login operation can be done before, during and after the step of processing the payment media and is

initiated by the user once for each time the payment media is received in the input receptacle [Keith teaches an embodiment where an operator (i.e. supervisor) {column 11, lines 38-40} selects a "multi-cashier shift" {column 12, line 5} and sets up appropriate "cashier numbers" which will be utilized by the drop safe for that business day {see column 12, lines 4-6}. In said embodiment, an "individual cashier making a deposit must enter the cashier number in the keypad before the acceptors will accept a transfer" "for each transfer into the drop safe" {column 13, lines 57-59 & lines 54-55}. Keith ('038) discloses a means to verify the cashier number {column 12, lines 9-14}].

Lastly, Keith ('038) teaches storing the payment media received in the input receptacle in a secure device until the user login operation is completed; [column 2, lines 54-55, "present drop safe comprises a secure housing" & column 2, lines 57-58, "bill acceptor is built into the drop safe, preferably mounted on a lockable door" & column 6, lines 32-34, "if the bill passes examination, the acceptor transfers that bill to a currency cassette associated with that acceptor" & column 6, line 41 "sealed and locked currency cassettes". Examiner notes that since login was initiated and "completed" by user before processing, Applicant's "until" limitation becomes inoperative].

As per Claim 3, Keith ('038) teaches the method of Claim [1] above. Further, Keith ('038) teaches wherein the secure device comprises **one** or more of a roll store in the machine, an escrow device in the machine, **or** a secure compartment in the machine. [column 6, line 41, "sealed and locked currency cassettes"]

As per Claim 4, Keith ('038) teaches the method of Claim 1 above. **Further,** Keith ('038) teaches wherein the user login operation is performed at the machine, is performed from a

location electronically coupled to the machine over a local communication network **or** is performed from a

location electronically coupled to the machine over a wide area communication network. [column 13,

lines 58-59, "must enter the cashier number in the keypad" & column 3, lines 1-8,

"keypad" is part of the machine].

As per Claim 7, Keith ('038) teaches the method of Claim 1 above.

However, Keith ('038) does not explicitly disclose wherein users of the machine are employees

from plural companies and the machine is located to allow access by the users. Regardless, Examiner

points Applicant to the applicable logic and evidence as discussed in Claim 6. (i.e. more

than one company employee is a user, e.g. cashier is an employee of the store and

armored car messenger is an employee of the service). Further, the machine is clearly

located to allow access by the users as evidenced by their interaction with the machine

[see Keith ('038) generally].

As per Claim 11, Keith ('038) teaches the method of Claim 1 above. **Further,** Keith

('038) teaches wherein the payment media is **one** or more of currency notes [column 14, lines 47-

48, "accept bills"], currency coins, currency vouchers and currency checks.

As per Claim 18, Keith ('038) teaches the method of Claim 1 above. **Further,** Keith

('038) teaches the user login operation is performed using a user interface of the machine. [column 4,

lines 66-67, "keypad for entering information and a visual display for displaying

information to an operator" & column 13, lines 38 & 39, "enter the cashier number in the

keypad"].

As per Claim 23, Keith ('038) teaches [a] machine-readable storage medium that provides

instructions for controlling a machine [column 10, lines42-43, "memory for storing the

microprocessor operating program"] that accepts payment media and that requires a user login

operation, the instructions, when executed by a processor, cause the processor to perform operations

[column 10, lines 40-41, "programmable microprocessor programmed to function"]

comprising [the method of Claim 1 above]. [Examiner points Applicant to the evidence as

discussed in Claim 1 above].

As per Claim 35, Keith ('038) teaches a machine...comprising [components capable of performing

the method as discussed in Claims 1, 18 & 23 above]. [Examiner points Applicant to the evidence

as provided in Claims 1, 18 & 23 above.]

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 5 & 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keith, III et

al [5,695,038] in view of Official Notice.

As per Claim 5, Keith ('038) teaches the method of Claim 1 above.

Further, Keith ('038) teaches wherein the machine is located in a retail store [column 2, lines

54-57, "drop safe...intended for mounting near a location of cash transactions, such as a

point-of-sale (POS) terminal or a conventional cash register" & column 1, lines 10-11,

"retail sales outlets such as convenience stores and gas stations" & column 3, line 32,

"store or other location of the safe"], and the user is a cashier of the retail store [column 3, lines

5-6, "cashiers...to deposit currency in the safe"], a teller **or** an individual not skilled in the

operation of payment media handling devices.

However, Keith ('038) does not explicitly disclose wherein the retail store includes at least one

single store, multiple stores, at least one third party concession stand located within the at least one single

store **and** a plurality of stores located within a mall. Regardless, Official Notice is taken that it is

old and well established that business entities often sell goods/services through a single

store (i.e. sole proprietorship), multiple stores (i.e. franchises), third-party concession

stands located in stores (i.e. an independent coffee shop in a book store), and through a

plurality of stores located within a mall (i.e. consider the definition of a mall). As such, it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of Applicant's

invention, to modify Keith ('038) to include such further limitations. Here, Keith ('038)

specifically contemplates its process as being carried out in a retail store context. [see

above citations] The technical ability existed to substitute other known retail stores and

the result of the substitution is predictable. Uncontested by Applicant, the functionality

of the machine does not appear to be affected by or dependent upon where it is placed.

[see Final Office Action, page 16, lines 15-16].

As per Claim 6, Keith ('038) teaches the method of Claim 1 above.

Further, Keith ('038) teaches wherein the machine is located in a retail store, [see Claim 5]

However, Keith ('038) does not explicitly disclose the user is an employee of a company

different from the retail store Regardless, Keith ('038) does disclose an "armored-car service

or other messenger" logging into its machine [see column 3, lines 33-42] to remove the

machine's contents [see column 16, line 1]. Here, in line with Claim 1, Examiner notes

that said 'service' logs in to extract the payment media from its secure storage (i.e.

cassettes) after the payment media has been received and processed. In this vein, Keith

('038) does not explicitly disclose its service logging in "each time the payment media is

received". Nevertheless, Keith ('038) teaches the ability to "summon the messenger to

replace the cassette" "in response to the transfer of currency exceeding a predetermined

amount into the acceptor cassettes" [see column 19, lines 51-59, e.g. any amount could be used as a trigger]. As such, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of Applicant's invention, to modify Keith ('038) to include such further limitations. The technical ability existed to summon an employee of a company different from the retail store to login to its machine. Summoning after any type of drop leads to predictable results (i.e. functionality the same whether extracting one currency drop or many currency drops).

Lastly, Keith ('038) does not explicitly disclose wherein the retail store includes at least one single store, multiple stores, at least one third party concession stand located within the single store and a plurality of stores located within a mall. [Examiner points Applicant to the logic and evidence as discussed in Claim 5 above.].

Claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keith, III et al [5,695,038] in view of Bankier et al [2002/0103663].

As per Claim 8, Keith ('038) teaches the method of Claim 1 above.

Further, Keith ('038) teaches wherein the processing of the payment media comprises feeding the payment media through the machine [column 14, line 30-31, "acceptor transfers that bill to the cassette"].

However, Keith ('038) does not explicitly disclose the user login operation is performed while the payment media is being fed through the machine. Regardless, Keith ('038) discloses an embodiment where an operator (i.e. supervisor) [column 11, lines 38-40] selects a "single-cashier [] shift" [column 12, lines 4-5] and sets up appropriate "cashier number"

which will be utilized by the drop safe for that business day [see column 12, lines 4-6].

In said embodiment, "the cashier need not enter his or her cashier number for each

transfer into the drop safe" and "the cashier may simply present bills to an acceptor any

time throughout the shift" [column 13, lines 54-55, i.e. login is not required as a

condition precedent for the machine of Keith ('038) to process currency]. In this vein,

Bankier ('663) pertains to "servicing and managing [machine] transactions" [see

paragraph 3]. Here, interactions between a user and a "retailer/provider" [paragraph 54]

machine (i.e. server {paragraph 61}) may entail "Login" [paragraph 55] and transaction

processing (i.e. "Add items to a shopping cart" {paragraph 57}) which "may not happen

sequentially" [paragraph 61, i.e. login is not a condition precedent to machine transaction

processing]. In particular, "users [may] add items to their shopping cart, and then login

before finally creating an order [or] login first, and then add items to a shopping cart, and

then create an order" [see Id]. Here, Applicant previously failed to contest that one of

skill in the art would realize that [] web sites such as Amazon.com permit a user to login

to one's account before, during and after order processing [see Final Office Action, page

8, lines 5-7]. As such, in view of this known login flexibility, it would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of Applicant's invention, to modify Keith

('038) to include the user login operation initiated by the user while transaction

processing is taking place. As previously noted, one would have done so given the

practical motivations for using a login in the first place. Uncontested by Applicant,

logins are implemented for reasons including security and for associating actions to an

entity/individual [see Final Office Action, page 8, lines 11-12 & Keith ('038), paragraph

column 13, lines 37-39]. In this vein, similar to filling a shopping cart, security is not an

issue when feeding, counting and/or validating user money because the chance of loss is

on the user, not the machine/retailer. Here, it is only when a money transfer is to occur

(i.e. machine is responsible for crediting an account, or a purchase is to take place) that

login is critical. Uncontested by Applicant, one of skill in the art would appreciate that

login could be at any time before, during, and after intermediate processing so long as

login has been completed by the time of money transfer. [see Final Office Action, page 8,

lines 16-18]. Keith ('038) would desire this given that it appreciates cashier "overall

accountability" [column 11, line 53]. Further, Bankier ('663) supports using "highly

reliable security to ensure proper completion of [] transactions" [paragraph 5].

As per Claim 9, Keith ('038) as modified teaches the method of Claim 8 above.

Further, Keith ('038) teaches wherein the processing of the payment media includes at least **one** of

counting the payment media [column 2, line 40, "count currency"], determining a denomination of

the payment media [column 2, lines 65, "denominations of accepted currency"] and

authenticating the payment media [column 6, lines 31-32, "evaluate its authenticity"].

As per Claim 10, Keith ('038) as modified teaches the method of Claim 9 above.

Further, Keith ('038) teaches wherein the payment media is **one** or more of currency notes [column

14, lines 47-48, "accept bills"], currency coins, and currency checks.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keith, III et al

[5,695,038] in view of Katou et al [6,481,620].

As per Claim 12, Keith ('038) teaches the method of Claim 1 above.

However, Keith ('038) does not explicitly disclose wherein the machine is capable of dispensing payment media previously accepted into the machine Regardless, Katou ('620) teaches a bill recycling machine [see Title]. As such it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of Applicant's invention, to modify Keith ('038) to include the machine as capable of dispensing payment media previously accepted into the machine. One would have done so given that deposit *and* withdrawal are known common features of currency machines. Further, as evidenced by Katou ('620), the technical ability exists to dispense previously accepted payment media and the results of such an embodiment are predictable (i.e. ability to receive and dispense currency). Practically, Keith ('038) may desire such a dispensing function if the "set amount" of currency on hand [see column 2, lines 2-3] is low to "reduce the amount of money at risk" [column 1, lines 22-23] and the deposited currency is necessary to break large bills.

Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keith, III et al [5,695,038] in view of Rosen [5,453,601].

As per Claim 13, Keith ('038) teaches the method of Claim 1 above.

However, Keith ('038) does not explicitly disclose wherein the processing of the payment media is cancelled following a plurality of failures of the user login operation. Regardless, Rosen ('601) teaches a method/system to "perform[] money transactions" via "transaction devices" using "electronic media" [see Abstract, i.e. "electronic money that is interchangeable with conventional paper money"]. In particular, Rosen ('601) teaches a user initiated sign-on [see column 37, lines 21-23] where "sign-on may be inhibited if a user makes

several unsuccessful attempts to sign-on" [column 37, lines 27-28]. Here, after an

allowable number of consecutive unsuccessful attempts have been made, user is

"prohibit[ed] any further sign-on attempts". [column 37, line 33]. As such, it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of Applicant's invention, to

modify Keith ('038) to include such further limitations. Here, Rosen ('601) teaches a

device login process as modified in such a way to increase security. The technical ability

existed to improve the login process of Keith ('038) in the same way and the result of the

improvement is predictable (i.e. access/processing is prohibited after a plurality of login

failures). Here, in a before payment media processing login operation context,

processing is effectively cancelled following a plurality of failures of the user login

operation.

As per Claim 14, Keith ('038) as modified teaches the method of Claim 13.

However, Keith ('038) does not explicitly disclose wherein, following the plurality of failures of

the user login operation, the machine returns to the user the same payment media that was received into the

input receptacle by the user. Regardless, Rosen ('601) seeks to provide a secure and reliable

monetary system. [see Abstract]. Here, even after "a proper sign-on is accomplished"

[see column 38, lines 19-20, Examiner notes that a proper sign-on may not be a

legitimate sign-on (i.e. stolen login, hackers, etc.).], Rosen ('601) teaches a "Maintain

Security" process [column 38, line 43 & column 40, lines 55-57, "exchange certificates to

verify that each money module is interacting with another valid money module"] where

"if [a] certificate is found invalid...the session is terminated" [column 40, lines 63-64]. In

particular, upon abnormal termination of a session, Rosen ('601) suggests "functional

shut-off of [the] money module" [column 41, lines 33-34] as well as "reversing or rolling

back [] changes" [column 41, lines 43-44] including "all accounting transactions that

have been undertaken" [column 42, lines 7-8]. As such, it would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of Applicant's invention, to modify Keith

('038) to include such further limitations. Here, Rosen ('601) suggests verifying a login

session during processing [i.e. Maintain Security process] and that "any invalid

information" should result in aborting the transaction taking place through reversal of the

transaction (i.e. reversal, in the context of Keith ('038) would be returning of the same

payment media that was received). As further support, Keith ('038) teaches the ability to

return received money to a user [column 6, line 36].

As per Claim 15, Keith ('038) teaches the method of Claim 3 above.

However, Keith ('038) does not explicitly disclose wherein the same payment media stored in

the escrow device is returned to the user following an unsuccessful login operation. Examiner points

Applicant to the logic and evidence discussed in Claim 14 above. Here, to practically

reverse a transaction deemed illegitimate, the machine would return the received payment

media from wherever it was "temporarily" stored [Keith ('038), Abstract].

Claims 16 & 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keith,

III et al [5,695,038].

As per Claim 16, Keith ('038) teaches the method of Claim 1 above.

However, Keith ('038) does not explicitly disclose notifying the user that the payment media

processing has been successfully completed upon occurrence of a successful user login operation and the

successful completion of the processing. Regardless, Keith ('038) does contemplate successful

user login for processing to occur [column 13, lines 57-59] as well as successful

completion of the processing [column 14, lines 29-31]. Here, Keith ('038) discloses that

its "processor maintains in memory running total counts" [column 12, lines 34-35] as

well as the accumulation and retention of "certain kinds of information, such as the dates

and times of currency transfers into the drop safe, the number and dollar value of each

transfer, and the cumulative total of bills and their dollar value accepted into the drop

safe". [column 11, lines 23-27]. In this vein, Keith ('038) teaches the ability to print

"tickets" which summarize cashier drops. [see column 14, lines 55-65]. Further, Here,

Keith ('038) indicates that an operator (i.e. cashier) [column 11, lines 38-40] can utilize

its machine menus to end their shift and receive a "shift report summarizing information

for that shift" [column 12, lines 48-54]. As such, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art, at the time of Applicant's invention, to modify Keith ('038) to

include such further limitations. Here if summary tickets associated with drops can be

automatic and summary reports can be requested on demand, tickets/reports could be

provided after each drop with predictable results (i.e. cashier receives a notice

summarizing the drop(s) being made).

As per Claim 17, Keith ('038) as modified teaches the method of Claim 16 above.

Further, Keith ('038) teaches storing the payment media in the machine upon a determination of a

successful user login operation and the successful completion of the processing. [Examiner points

Applicant to the evidence presented in Claim 16 above.]

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John D. Scarito whose telephone number is (571) 270-3448. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th (7:30-5:00), Alternate F (7:30-4:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Dixon can be reached on (571) 272-6803. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John D. Scarito/   /Frantzy Poinvil/
Examiner, Art Unit 3696   Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3696

May 26, 2009